

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-21 will be pending in the application. Claims 20-21 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

Claim 9 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 10, now canceled.

Claim 11 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 12, now canceled.

Entry of the Amendment along with reconsideration and review on the merits are respectfully requested.

***Formal Matters***

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that the drawings filed on December 1, 2003 are accepted.

Applicants also appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgement of Applicants' claim for foreign priority and receipt of copies of the priority document.

The Examiner states that the Japanese documents in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on December 1, 2003, have not been considered because no abstract or translation of the foreign documents was provided. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. In the IDS, Applicants previously complied with the concise explanation requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(3) for foreign language documents, by citing to Applicants' specification beginning at page 3, line 2, which references and describes Japanese Patent published applications 11-204587A and 11-084422A. Thus, Applicants request reconsideration of the IDS filed on December 1, 2003.

Applicants also request consideration of the IDS filed on February 3, 2006.

***Response to Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103***

- A. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as assertedly being anticipated by Sera et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0025848), for the reasons given in the Office Action.
- B. Claims 7-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as assertedly being anticipated by Kawata (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,020); or by Ohtani et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0071072), for the reasons given in the Office Action.
- C. Claims 1-6, 10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Kawata, or over Ohtani, in view of the remarks given in the Office Action, for the reasons given in the Office Action.

Applicants respond as follows.

As previously noted, Claim 9 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 10, and Claim 11 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 12. Thus, Claims 9 and 11 recite that the carrier concentration of the second light-shielding film is about  $10^{17}/\text{cm}^3$ .

The present inventions of Claims 1 and 13 feature the carrier concentration of the surface portion of the second light-shielding film which opposes the active layer being about  $10^{17}/\text{cm}^3$ . And the present invention of Claim 7 features that the electric field intensity of the surface portion of the second light-shield film opposing the active layer is about 80% or less of that of the first light-shield film. These features alleviate the potential caused by the first light-shield film by 20% or more, whereby the influence by the leakage current caused by the backgate is

reduced to a lower level even if the insulator film disposed between the light-shield film and the active layer has a smaller thickness.

The cited references are silent as to the feature and the function of the present invention as described above. Sera describes first and second light-shield films; however, Sera does not describe the carrier concentration or electric field intensity thereof. Sera does not describe or even suggest the leakage current caused by the backgate. Other references to Kawata and Otani also do not describe the carrier concentration or electric field intensity as well as the leakage current caused by the backgate.

Thus, the present inventions defined in independent Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 13 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Dependent Claims 2-6, 8 and 14-18 are patentable for at least their dependency on Claims 1, 7 and 13.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation and obviousness rejections.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/721,040

Atty. Docket No. Q76864

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

John K. Shin  
Registration No. 48,409

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 13, 2006